

# APPENDIX I - Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report

## Table of Contents

APPENDIX I - Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report .....	I-3
ARTICLE 1 - Overview .....	I-3
The Encroachment Permit Application Review Form.....	I-3
The Permit Engineering Evaluation Report .....	I-3
Special Funded Project if Cost is Over \$1,000,000 .....	I-3
Projects Not Requiring a PEER .....	I-4
Purpose of a PEER.....	I-4
Report Format .....	I-4
ARTICLE 2 - Guidelines for Completing the PEER Form.....	I-4



# APPENDIX I - Preparation Guidelines for Permit Engineering Evaluation Report

---

---

## ARTICLE 1 - Overview

### **The Encroachment Permit Application Review Form**

Refer to Chapter 9, Article 13, for the Permit Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER) process. The Encroachment Permit Application Review form is used by the district permits unit for transmitting encroachment permit proposals that cost up to \$1,000,000 within state right of way to other Caltrans units for review. The reviewing units must fully detail their comments about the proposal and their number of review hours. The responsible unit as determined by the District Permits Engineer is designated on this form. The responsible unit must determine whether a PEER is required, and if so, attach it or indicate the estimated completion date. If the unit determines that there will be no adverse impact on highway operations, maintenance, and tort liability, it will indicate so in the appropriate box shown on the Encroachment Permit Application Review form with the signature by at least a senior level person. The unit will then do its usual permit review, fill out the rest of the form, and return it to the District Permit Engineer. If there will be impacts, a PEER is required and the unit will be responsible for the preparation and review and securing the approval of the PEER. Some projects costing over \$300,000 may be required to utilize the Combined PSR/PR format as a project report if they are too complex to utilize the PEER format.

### **The Permit Engineering Evaluation Report**

A Project Report (PR) or a PEER is required for every action that has a permanent traffic impact and for work that affects the operating capability of a state highway facility. These reports, and their preparation, are the responsibility of either Project Development or Traffic Operations. However, the District Permit Unit must verify that responsible and reviewing units have considered the need for the appropriate report and have correctly completed the Encroachment Permit Application Review form.

### **Special Funded Project if Cost is Over \$1,000,000**

The District Permit Engineer determines the magnitude of the work. An encroachment or public transit project that costs more than \$1,000,000 and is located within state right of way is considered a special funded project and will require a Combined PSR/PR if it qualifies, or a PSR and a PR if it does not. The Combined PSR/PR process is described in Chapter 9, Article 12, and in Appendix A.

## **Projects Not Requiring a PEER**

Projects not requiring a PEER usually are for commercial filming, miscellaneous activities, special events, surveys, and utilities.

## **Purpose of a PEER**

A PEER is prepared to document the engineering analysis of proposed work. The analysis includes review of the proposed improvements to determine drainage, maintenance, operation, and environmental impact on the state highway system. Proposed improvements must conform to Caltrans' current design standards and practices or be justified by an approved design exception. Additional information may be requested from the applicant if it is needed to perform the reviews. A permit may be denied based upon conclusions of the reviews.

## **Report Format**

The PEER should be prepared and submitted using the form shown in the following pages (form number TR-0112). The following article provides guidelines for specific items on the form.

# **ARTICLE 2 - Guidelines for Completing the PEER Form**

### Hours for Preparing

Give the total hours used in investigating and preparing the PEER by all parties. PEER preparation is considered part of the permit review process. The time needed to evaluate and finalize the PEER will depend on the scope and complexity of the work. When it can be done within the review deadline, the PEER should be attached to the review form and returned to the Permit Engineer,. When more time is needed, the review form should be returned immediately to the Permit Engineer, notifying of the estimated date of PEER completion and whether or not additional information is needed.

### Permit Number

Permit number assigned to permit application by District Permit Office (if appropriate)

### Date

Date of completion of the PEER

### District / County / Route/ Kilometer Post (Post Mile) [Dist-Co-Rte-KP(PM)]

The Kilometer Post should be given to the nearest 0.1 kilometer; if the project is 0.2 kilometers or more in length, give both the beginning and ending Kilometer Post. Post Mile should follow Kilometer Post if needed for continuity of file references or other reasons.

EA Used

The Expenditure Authorization (EA) used to charge costs for the permit review process as spelled out in Chapter 2 of the *Encroachment Permits Manual*.

Applicant

Name of individual, agency or organization submitting permit proposal.

1. Describe Permit Proposal, What It Serves, Approximate Cost

Provide a brief narrative containing statements that are concise but include the information needed to describe the proposed work.

2. Describe Existing Highway - Brief Analysis of Impact on Highway Operation and Maintenance

Evaluate the impacts of the permit proposal upon the State highway.

3. Analysis of Permit Proposal for Geometric and Functional Adequacy

Summarize the findings of the determination of the geometric and functional adequacy of the permit proposal. All statements should be concise and contain the information needed to justify (or reject) the proposed work.

3a. Non-Standard Design Features

Check "Yes" or "No" indicating whether nonstandard design features are involved and if they are provide the rationale for approval of an exception. If yes, give name and date of approval of the PD Coordinator who approved the Fact Sheet for Exception to Mandatory Design Standards. If FHWA concurrence in the Fact Sheet is needed, obtain this on a separate sheet and attach it.

4. Revision in Access Control or Transfer of R/W to Permittee Involved

Check Yes or No.

4a. If Yes, Date of District Director Approval

If the permit proposal involves a reduction in access control or the transfer of Caltrans right of way to the permittee, a request must first be made to the District Director (DD) for authorization to decertify and dispose of the property rights involved. See Chapter 26 "Disposal of Rights of Way" for processing instructions. Indicate the date the DD approved the revision.

4b. If Interstate, Date of FHWA Approval

If FHWA concurrence is needed for a change in access on the Interstate system, give the date of approval.

5. Signalization Involved

Check YES or NO. If the answer is "yes", answer the next four questions by checking YES, NO or NOT APPLICABLE.

If the answer to any of the four questions is "no", provide an explanation and any comments on an attached sheet.

Permit Proposal Recommended

Check either "Yes, as submitted", "Yes, with conditions described above", or "No, as described above". List conditions in Item 3. Indicate reasons for "No, as described above" in Item 3.

Prepared by

Title

- Name of individual who prepared this report and who should be contacted regarding the proposal.
- Title of individual preparing the PEER.

Registered Engineer Stamp

The PEER must be prepared by a Caltrans registered civil engineer. The stamp or seal and signature and date must be placed on the report, in the space provided for the engineer in responsible charge of the evaluation.

Unit

The unit source code of the registered engineer in responsible charge of the evaluation of the proposal.

Approved by

Title

Date Approved

- Signature of the District Director or the District Division Chief to whom approval authority has been delegated.
- Title of individual approving the PEER.
- Date approved.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION <b>PERMIT ENGINEERING EVALUATION REPORT</b> TR-0112 (REV. 8/94)		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">HOURS FOR PREPARING</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">PERMIT NO.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">DATE</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">DIST / CO / RTE / PM</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">EA USED</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">APPLICANT</td> </tr> </table>		HOURS FOR PREPARING	PERMIT NO.	DATE	DIST / CO / RTE / PM	EA USED	APPLICANT
HOURS FOR PREPARING	PERMIT NO.								
DATE	DIST / CO / RTE / PM								
EA USED	APPLICANT								
1. DESCRIBE PERMIT PROPOSAL, WHAT IT SERVES, APPROXIMATE COST.									
2. DESCRIBE EXISTING HIGHWAY - BRIEF ANALYSIS OF IMPACT ON HIGHWAY OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE.									
3. ANALYSIS OF PERMIT PROPOSAL FOR GEOMETRIC AND FUNCTIONAL ADEQUACY.									
3a. NON - STANDARD DESIGN FEATURES ?		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>							
If YES above, provide rationale, name and date of Project Development reviewer's concurrence. ( on Federal Aid Projects, FHWA concurrence )									
4. REVISION IN ACCESS CONTROL OR TRANSFER OF R/W TO PERMITTEE INVOLVED ?		YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>							
4a. IF YES, DATE OF DISTRICT DIRECTOR APPROVAL.									
4b. IF INTERSTATE, DATE OF FHWA APPROVAL.		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; text-align: center;">REGISTERED ENGINEER STAMP</div>							
5. SIGNALIZATION INVOLVED ? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If yes, signal warrants met <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO* <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE Capacity Analysis OK <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO* <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE Safety Analysis OK <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO* <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE Ownership / Maintenance Provisions OK <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO* <input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE <i>* address Comments on an attached sheet</i>		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; min-height: 150px;">           I attest to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions were based.            SIGNATURE OF REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER         </div>							
PERMIT PROPOSAL RECOMMENDED <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, as submitted <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, with conditions described above <input type="checkbox"/> No, as described above									
PREPARED BY	TITLE	UNIT							
APPROVED BY	TITLE	DATE APPROVED	DATE						
EP 94 0016      REMARKS: SEND ONE COPY OF COMPLETED REPORT TO HEADQUARTERS OFFICE OF PROJECT PLANNING & DESIGN									

[illegible]